UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,992	03/03/2004	Morton G. Swimmer	CH920020050US1	4840

48233   7590   09/07/2007

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER
FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 20-21 and 23 have been amended.

2.   Claims 1-23 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 11 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

4.   Referring to the rejection of claims 1 and 10, the Applicant contends that the prior

art (Wang) does not teach, disclose, nor suggest a step of classifying access requests

into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on stored access control data

associated with the object and the task. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and

asserts that Wang discloses three classes of actions wherein two are non-critical

classes and one is a critical class. The first non-critical class is shown within the ACMO

(Access Control Model Object). User A is classified into class 1, a non-critical class,

wherein the user is authorized to read library objects and any other library object which

is publicly available within its associated ACMO (See Column 4, lines 59-67)

User B is classified into class 2, a critical class, wherein the user is authorized to write

into a library object as well as any other library object which includes shared

authorization only if prior checking of the access control data is performed within the

ACMO. (See Column 5, lines 1-4)

User C is classified into class 3, a non-critical class, wherein permission does not need

to be checked prior to granting access to the ACMO. This user is permitted unlimited

authority with regard to library objects and any other library object which includes

shared authorization. (See Column 5, lines 4-7)

5.   Referring to the rejection of claims 1 and 10, the Applicant contends that the prior

art (Wang) does not teach, disclose, nor suggest granting task access to the object and

storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the

non-critical class. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that Wang

discloses a distributed data processing network for users to access a data object or

document stored in another portion of the data processing network. If the user is

classified into a non-critical class the data is stored within an access control profile

associated with a group of users permitted based upon the level of authority and

identifying the user (See Column 3, lines 59-67, Column 4, lines 1-8)

6.   Referring to the rejection of claims 1 and 10, the Applicant contends that the prior

art (Wang) does not teach, disclose, nor suggest in the event that the access is

classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in

dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data. The

Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that Wang discloses a specific public

authority level not listed within the ACMO, the request for a document is denied. The

user must meet the requirements for determining public authority level from a critical

class in order to gain access to objects or tasks within a shared authorization parameter

(See Column 6, lines 12-23)

7.   Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-23 are maintained in view of the reasons

above and in view of the reasons below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9.   Claims 1-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Wang (US Patent No. 5,414,844).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome

either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the

invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Referring to the rejection of claims 1,10,20, and 23, Wang discloses a

method, apparatus, computer program product, and system for controlling access to an

object in a data processing system, comprising:

receiving an access request to access the object from a task; (See Column 5,

lines 60-63)

classifying the access request into one of critical and non-critical classes in

dependence on stored access control data associated with the object and the task; (See Column 5, lines 66-67, Column 6, lines 1-8)

granting the task access to the object and storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the non-critical class; (See Column 6, lines 8-11)

and, in the event that the access is classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data (See Column 6, lines 12-23)

Referring to the rejection of claims 2 and 11, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein in the event that the access is classified into the non-critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the access control data, and storing data indicative of the grant or denial in the access log. (See Column 6, lines 37-42)

Referring to the rejection of claims 3 and 12, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein the non-critical class comprises a plurality of subclasses and the classifying comprises classifying the access request into one of the subclasses in dependence on the stored access control data. (See Column 4, lines 2-8)

Referring to the rejection of claims 4 and 13, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein the subclasses comprise a first subclass and a second subclass. (See Column 5, lines 27-35)

Referring to the rejection of claims 5 and 14, Wang discloses the claimed

limitation wherein storing recovery data in the access log if the access is classified into

the second subclass. (See Column 5, lines 36-56)

Referring to the rejection of claims 6 and 15, Wang discloses the claimed

limitation wherein inspecting the access log to identify a bad grant decision based on

the contents of the access log and the access control data; (See Column 6, lines 12-20)

and, on detection of a bad grant decision, rolling back any objects affected by the

bad grant decision. (See Column 6, lines 20-23)

Referring to the rejection of claims 7 and 16, Wang discloses the claimed

limitation wherein the rolling back comprises recovering data overwritten in the object.

(See Column 5, lines 1-7)

Referring to the rejection of claims 8 and 17, Wang discloses the claimed

limitation wherein performing the inspecting periodically. (See Column 3, lines 18-24)

Referring to the rejection of claims 9 and 18, Wang discloses the claimed

limitation wherein performing the inspecting during periods in which the data processing

system is otherwise idle. (See Column 5, lines 60-65)

Referring to the rejection of claim 19, Wang discloses a data processing system,

comprising:

a central processor unit; (See Column 3, lines 8-12)

a memory; (See Column 3, lines 12-15)

and apparatus as recited in claim 10 connected to the central processor unit and

the memory. (See Column 3, lines 35-39)

Referring to the rejection of claims 21 and 22, Wang discloses a article of manufacture and a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for controlling access to an object in a data processing system, said method steps comprising the steps of claim 1. (See Column 3, lines 16-23)

Conclusion

1.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

cdf
August 31, 2007

CYNTHIA BRITT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9-4-07